

Illinois U Library

APRIL 4, 1946

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



Should We Continue the Draft Beyond May 15?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

HOWARD C. PETERSON
REAGAN (TEX) McCRARY

MILLARD LAMPELL
QUINCY HOWE

(See also page 12)

COMING

—April 11, 1946—

**What Are the Real Issues Behind the Russian-
Iranian Dispute?**

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.

VOLUME 11, NUMBER 49



\$4.50 A YEAR : 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF APRIL 4:

"Should We Continue the Draft Beyond May 15?"

Mr. DENNY	3
Mr. PETERSON	4
Mr. LAMPELL	5
Mr. McCRARY	8
Mr. HOWE	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	16



THE BROADCAST OF APRIL 11:

"What Are the Real Issues Behind the Russian-Iranian Dispute?"



The Broadcast of April 4, 1946, originated in Town Hall, in New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., E.S.T., over the American Broadcasting Company Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Illinois U Library *Town Meeting*



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



APRIL 4, 1946

VOL. 11, No. 49

Should We Continue the Draft Beyond May 15?

Announcer:

Yes, friends, it's Town Meeting time in Town Hall in New York City, just off Times Square and the American Broadcasting Company and associated radio stations from coast to coast bring you America's favorite forum program in a timely discussion of the question "Should We Continue the Draft Beyond May 15?" Here is our moderator, the president of Town Hall, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. If you are a young man approaching eighteen years of age or if you're a father of such a young man, you may think tonight's question should be answered with an emphatic "No." But if your family is not touched directly by the draft, you may be inclined to answer "Yes."

My old geology professor used to begin his lectures in geology something like this: "Well, young

men, we're largely what we are because we're where we are, and that goes for folks as well as rocks."

At last we're beginning to realize that it's not safe to make decisions affecting the national welfare purely on the basis of how these decisions may immediately affect us, nor can we make them wholly on the basis of what appears to be our national interests, for, whether we like it or not, science and the machine age have made us citizens of the world. And whether we like this fact or not, we are all members of the human race.

So if we're to do justice to our subject tonight, we must consider it realistically in terms of the whole picture. We want to know the best way of meeting the present needs of our armed forces, what these needs are, and why they are what they are.

So, gentlemen, it's a large order and we're greatly pleased to wel-

come you to Town Hall. The Assistant Secretary of War, Howard C. Peterson and former Lieutenant Colonel "Tex" McCrary of the Army Air Forces feel that we should continue the draft beyond May 15. Mr. Quincy Howe, radio commentator, author, and editor; and Mr. Millard Lampell, former sergeant of the Army Air Forces, think we should not.

Now, may we hear the statement of the affirmative, first from the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Howard C. Peterson. Mr. Secretary. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Peterson:

I urge that the Selective Service Act be extended to May 15, 1947. Why? As Mr. Denny has said, the answer involves three basic questions:

What are the Army's tasks?

How many men do they require?

And how can we get these men?

Turning now to the tasks. Foremost among the Army's tasks, is the occupation of Germany and Japan. Our aim is to destroy their power and will to make future war and assist their re-entry into the family of nations. To achieve these aims will require substantial occupying forces for some time to come. I am sure that even Mr. Lampell and Mr. Howe will agree that we must not fail to do this job.

The second major job is to provide armed forces for the United Nations. As a great power, we

must contribute a relatively large quota for this purpose in order to make the United Nations work. The success of this organization is our best hope for world peace. I am sure that Mr. Lampell and Mr. Howe will also agree that we must fully meet our commitments to the United Nations.

As its third major task, the Army must close down its world-wide wartime organization. It must withdraw from far-flung foreign bases. It must dispose of billions of dollars of surplus war property, both here and abroad. It must care for the wounded and disabled. It must protect and dismantle great numbers of military installations. It must clean up the thousands of leftovers from the war. It takes a lot of men just to handle the discharge and induction of soldiers.

The fourth military task is to make our country secure. To do this we must maintain bases to guard the vital approaches to the United States. We must have a strong program of scientific research and alert intelligence. Our military establishment must command respect. In a war-torn and unstable world, a strong United States is a positive force for peace. Weakness will be construed as a return to isolationism.

These are the major tasks. Now, how many men are needed to accomplish them?

That is a problem for experts.

General Eisenhower is our expert. His ability and judgment command confidence and respect. General Eisenhower has concluded that to do its job, the Army will require 1,550,000 men on July 1, 1946, but that it can be gradually reduced to 1,070,000 men by July 1, 1947.

If we are not to shirk our duty, the basic question is how to obtain the necessary forces. The Army would like to get all these men as volunteers. To that end, we are recruiting intensively and seeking to make army life more attractive in pay and other respects.

So far, we have recruited 650,000 men, but this figure is not a reliable guide to the future. The existence of Selective Service has certainly induced many to enlist. Even so, fewer men are volunteering each month. In March only about one-half as many men enlisted as in the peak month of November.

Without the stimulus of Selective Service, I am sure that volunteers will not meet our needs. If that occurs, we will not be able to perform our important tasks. At this stage of world history, this Nation cannot afford to take such a gamble. If Selective Service is allowed to expire, the damage will be irreparable. Its experienced machinery of over 6,500 local boards, manned by volunteers, would be disbanded and could not be rebuilt in time if needed later. But if the act is extended, any

shortage of volunteers may be made up promptly and fairly through its machinery.

Moreover, if we are wrong and enough men volunteer, no harm will come from extending the Act. In that case, no one will be drafted under Selective Service. In short, extension of the Act is cheap insurance, indeed, against losing the peace bought at such a great cost. Thank you. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Secretary Peterson, for giving us the facts as you see them and as the Army sees them, and stating the case. Now, we're going to hear from a young man who made a big hit on the Town Meeting when he appeared here in January just after he got out of his sergeant's uniform. I notice he's toned down a bit now—he's not wearing nearly as loud a tie. He's the author of a new book called *The Long Way Home*. Mr. Millard Lampell, the daddy of Peter. Mr. Lampell. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Lampell:

Being here tonight is really a GI's dream. All the time I was in the Army I used to imagine what it would be like to square off with "the brass." I used to figure on a colonel maybe, or an executive from the War Department. But in my wildest dreams I never figured on getting both of them at once. (*Laughter.*)

Nine months ago I was in an army hospital in New Mexico. It

was crowded and the only bed they had for me was in the plastic surgery ward. For six days I lived in a room with 15 GI's. Every one of them was missing part of his face.

The boy in the next bed was a pilot from Chicago named McKinney. He had his jaw shot away, and the grafted bones were beginning to heal. It had taken McKinney four months just to learn to say the name of his wife again.

You live in a ward like that and you don't forget it so easy. You begin to judge questions of politics and diplomacy by one standard—will it help prevent another war?

I'm no pacifist. I believed in the war—all of it, including the draft—because there was a good reason—the military defeat of fascism, without which there could have been no peace.

But when you're looking at extension of the draft you're looking at foreign policy, because an army is an instrument of foreign policy. At this moment, before the boys in that plastic surgery ward have learned to talk again, some men who can talk all too easily are starting the old game of power politics. The newspapers and the big brass tell us that the Army is falling to pieces, and without extension of the draft we won't be able to meet our military commitments.

General Eisenhower sets the figure for the number of troops we need, but that figure is based on a lot more than armies of occupation for Germany and Japan. Less than 600,000 troops would cover that by the Army's own figures, and Secretary Peterson has admitted that enlistments are already over that number; in fact, enlistments are the highest in history. But they still fall short of the Army's figure because that figure is based on a State Department policy that is now keeping American troops in more than 50 countries and islands, including Belgium, Bermuda, Burma, Cuba, Egypt, Iceland, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and Africa.

A large part of the need for the extension of the draft is not for the occupation of Germany and Japan, but to keep garrisons in friendly countries, and it's about time we brought those GI's home. (*Applause.*)

I'm in favor of occupying Germany and Japan, and I mean *really* occupying them. For plenty of GI's Germany is simply a place where the *frauleins* can take their candy bars and cigarettes and give them in exchange the lies that the French are degenerate and the Russians are dangerous and the Jews started the war. The Army gives a man shots to protect him from typhus, malaria, yellow fever, but never bothers to inoculate him against the disease of fascism.

The success of our occupation of Germany and Japan will depend not so much on the number of troops as on their ability to understand why they are there; their ability to spot fascism and to dig it out by the roots, which includes really cracking down on the cartels, the bankers, and industrialists (*applause*) who gave Hitler his money and guns—yes, cartels with branch offices right here in America. (*Applause.*)

Occupation of Germany and Japan and the UNO's international police force are legitimate places for our troops, and, if enlistment doesn't quite cover those needs, there is a very simple way of getting more volunteers. It's an old American idea. It's called democracy.

I remember being stationed at a post where we had a medical examination once a month for enlisted men only. The Army had made the interesting scientific discovery that being an officer automatically made a man immune to disease. (*Laughter.*) Let the War Department cut out senseless distinctions of rank, cut out actions like the recent censorship of *Stars and Stripes*, cut out segregating Negroes and forcing them into labor battalions (*applause*), and then watch the rate of enlistments rise.

We're told we need to extend the draft to keep a big Army for defense. War is a pretty bloody,

costly defense. There is a better one. Stop war before it starts!

War didn't come to America at Pearl Harbor on December 7. Wars doesn't come on any hour or any day. Peace slipped away slowly, day by day, as we failed to understand the threat of fascism and to move quickly against it.

We had a hundred Pearl Harbors before we fired a shot. Manchuria in 1931, Spain, Ethiopia, Munich. (*Applause.*) Every ton of scrap iron we sold to Japan was a Pearl Harbor. (*Applause.*)

We can look back and learn a few things about national defense. We won't defend our Nation by selling planes to Franco, by bringing Argentina into the UNO, by allowing the cartels to sit on the sidelines waiting to go back to work.

We won't defend ourselves by keeping unnecessary troops in friendly countries and then calling for extension of the draft. We will defend ourselves by learning about other nations, by respecting the rights and dignity of colonial people, by working in the council chamber to create an understanding, not a crisis.

We have a first line of defense all right. But it isn't the Army. It's right up there in the UNO at Hunter College. (*Applause.*)

During the past months, I have come to the bitter belief that there are people in this country who say "defense" and mean "war." I have

watched many newspapers and certain members of Congress deliberately try to lead us step by step along the road back to the battlefield. I have listened to Churchill's call for an Anglo-American power bloc and Vandenberg's "get-tough-with-Russia" talk.

To wage a war, a nation needs a large army, a supply of the latest, most powerful weapons, a country unravished and still strong enough to supply armies, and a people whose memory of death and starvation is not too bitterly clear.

The only nation that comes near filling those requirements is the United States. I remember those guys in the ward with their shattered faces and I think of other nations still scarred and counting their dead. I think of the force of atomic bombs and I say, I am against the extension of a draft because there is only one solution, only one pattern of survival now. That is to fashion for ourselves a real peace and to make it work! (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Millard Lampell. Whenever I introduce our next speaker, I always feel a little bit like calling him the cofounder of America's Town Meeting of the Air, because a long time ago when we started this program—about eleven years ago—I talked with him, a young man just out of Princeton, working with the old

Literary Digest. Well, he's gone a long way. He is a former editor, former lieutenant colonel, and now executive editor of the *American Mercury*. We're always glad to welcome you back to Town Meeting, "Tex" McCrary. (*Applause.*)

Mr. McCrary:

Mr. Lampell has spent a lot of time in hospitals talking to the wounded about how they hate war. Mr. Lampell is an excellent reporter, but I wonder if he ever talked to a green paratrooper who had had his backside shot off because there hadn't been time to train him to crawl instinctively with his belly as close to the ground as a turtle's. (*Applause.*)

The fact is, there never is time before a war starts to do a thorough training job. And why not? Because after every war, the draft and every other phase of national security becomes, for some strange reason, a political hot potato and Public Enemy No. 1.

While we are on the subject of training for war, I'd like to point out that exactly the same weaknesses crop up in our training in preparation for peace, for occupation duties at the end of war. We're trying to do an occupation job in Germany and Japan with men, many of them very young men, who have not been properly trained for the important job of policing and patching up countries

in which fascism is still instinctive and democracy is only a word.

It is a very significant fact that many of those who most loudly protest against extension of the draft are the same people who scream about the halfway job we are doing toward de-nazifying Germany, de-Shintoizing Japan and, in general, making democracy work in countries where most of the people now living cannot even remember democracy.

It takes men, good men well trained, to do that job and it probably takes more men because they are younger men. Without an extension of the draft we won't have those men, not enough of them.

It is true that our needs are only 600,000—a few over—to occupy Germany and Japan, but it takes other men, many more men, to train those men for the job, and a lot more men to feed and supply those men who are in the occupation countries.

In football you put eleven men on the field, on the first team, but it takes a squad of a hundred men to put that team of eleven into a game. (*Applause.*)

When you try to argue with some of the people who oppose the extension of the draft—parents, for instance—the argument gets pretty emotional. The parents will say their sons have a right to a job and a college education,

instead of having to go into the Army.

I wish those parents would please remember that even three months from now there will still be in the Army about 120,000 fathers. There will be 130,000 who will have been in for more than 18 months. They have a right to get back to their jobs, their education, their families (*applause*), but until more young men come into the army to bear their fair share of at least the aftermath of war, these fathers can't get out, the veterans can't get out.

I'd like to say one more thing to parents of draft-age boys. In the first place, your son is going to find it very hard to get into any college next fall, because almost all the space in colleges will be jam-packed with veterans, ex-GI's, and it is only fair that they should have first call on an education. The same thing goes for jobs. GI's deserve first call on jobs. There are about a million veterans unemployed right now.

Now let's look at it from another point of view. The training a boy gets in the Army is probably the best education he'll ever get for citizenship or for a job. I doubt very much if three years in college, or three years in his chosen profession of writing, would have meant as much to Sergeant Lampell as the training he got in the Air Forces (*applause*), either

as a writer or as the intelligent, responsible citizen he is today.

I know that twelve months in Europe in the occupation forces, or in Japan, would teach any 18-year-old boy a lot more about his responsibilities as a world citizen than any year at any college. (*Applause.*)

There's another group opposing the draft extension which seems to be a little mixed up in their reasoning—those who say that mass armies will have no use in future atomic wars. Sure, I agree with you. But we aren't talking about future wars. Certainly there will be no atomic attack on us for at least ten years, if ever. What we are talking about here is an extension of the draft *now* to give us the men we need *now* to wind up the work begun in the last war.

I think this Nation is obligated, and further that our own selfish interest lies in acceptance of the obligation, to prevent famine, riot, persecution, or aggression by political infiltration, or any other excesses that lead to war anywhere in the world.

Just now we happen to be locked in a poker game with Russia—a polite one up at Hunter College, and all over Europe and Asia. That poker game will not become war if we do not become weak. (*Applause.*)

The peoples of Europe and Asia will not forsake their hope of democracy if we keep enough men—

trained men—in Europe and Asia to make democracy work. To Russia, who can find out almost all they need to know about us without spies just by following the *New York Times* or listening to British BBC, an extension of the draft would be correctly interpreted as meaning that individual Americans accept mutual responsibility for waging the peace as steadfastly as we waged war. From that moment on, we will begin to get along very well with Russia and everybody else. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Tex McCrary. Our next speaker is one of our favorite radio commentators, author, editor of Simon & Schuster, and I am very happy to present our old friend Quincy Howe. Mr. Howe.

Mr. Howe:

I am sure that every one of us on this platform says, "Hear, hear!" to all that Tex McCrary had to say about Americans needing training for world citizenship. But Millard Lampell and I don't think that the extension of the draft will accomplish the purpose Tex McCrary has in mind.

Speaking only for myself, I not only agree with almost everything that Secretary Peterson has said, especially about occupation duties and obligations to the United Nations, I go further. I say as long as our State Department continues to follow its present line, our War Department ought to ask for much

more than Secretary Peterson has called for tonight. (*Applause.*)

The reason I oppose extending the draft is that I cannot think of a better way to bring the State Department up short and halt its present policy of drift and compromise.

My argument goes this way. If Congress extends the present draft act, it will be lulling the American people into a sense of false security and giving the foreign policy of the State Department a vote of confidence it does not deserve, for armies, navies, and air forces offer no protection against atomic weapons.

All the scientists who worked on the atom bomb have warned us with one voice that there is no defense in an atomic war. As Mr. McCrary has so well said, "We must start preparing now."

Again and again, though, victorious powers have prepared to fight the next war with the last war's weapons. The French believed in the Maginot Line until June of 1940, and so today our army and navy leaders place their main reliance on tanks, planes, and carriers. They back extension of the draft, as if 18-year-old boys could master the weapons of modern war in a single year of training.

In the atomic age, more than ever before, war is too serious a business to be left to the generals, especially to generals flushed with

a victory won with pre-atomic weapons. We can't be strong everywhere at once, either in military matters or in foreign affairs.

When, therefore, our War and Navy Departments campaign for extension of the draft, they distract attention from the far more urgent problems of atomic war. When Secretary of State Byrnes warns us that his foreign policy requires a mass conscript Army, we suspect him of redoubling his zeal after losing sight of his objective.

I ask Mr. Peterson and Mr. McCrary to consider the recent record. Last August, the State Department began questioning Russian policy in Bulgaria and Rumania. When it came to our occupation of Japan, our leaders didn't like it when the Russians started firing the same kind of questions at us. (*Applause.*)

Nobody questioned our purposes when President Truman sent General Marshal to China to arbitrate the civil war and help the Chinese set up a coalition government. But Washington felt it necessary to protest to Moscow on Russian activities in Manchuria and Iran.

The State Department has also thrown one of its books at Peron in Argentina and another book at Franco over in Spain. But because the State Department could not or would not back up its bold words with bold deeds, these two gestures boomeranged.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

MILLARD LAMPELL—A former sergeant in the Army Air Forces, Millard Lampell is the author of the recently published book, *The Long Way Home*. This book is a collection of 14 radio scripts having as their theme the readjustment and rehabilitation of war veterans. To get his material for these scripts, Mr. Lampell traveled 20,000 miles. Many of his facts are from first hand army duty in hospitals.

Mr. Lampell did the ballad and narration for the current motion picture, "A Walk in the Sun." He has a minor talent for the guitar, and a love for folk songs. After his graduation from college in 1940, he joined a group of blues and ballad singers in New York City. On cross-country tours, this group sang in logging camps, farmers' meetings, and the like. During this barn-storming, the group picked up about 500 "people's songs." Mr. Lampell composed the words for many others. This experience led to radio and writing as a combined career. The career was somewhat interrupted by the draft, but Mr. Lampell was put in the AAF Radio Unit. Currently he is active in veterans' affairs, writing a play, doing an occasional radio script, and thinking about a novel.

QUINCY HOWE—Mr. Howe, a radio news commentator since 1939, has been with the Columbia Broadcasting System since 1942. Born in Boston in 1900, he received his A.B. degree from Harvard in 1921. The following year he was a student at Christ's College, in Cambridge, England. From 1922 to 1928, he was

with the Atlantic Monthly Company; from 1929 to 1935, he was editor of *Living Age*; and since 1935, he has been associated with Simon and Schuster, Inc.

In 1939, Mr. Howe became a news commentator on station WQRX in New York, and in 1942 joined CBS. Mr. Howe is the author of *World Diary* (1929-34), *England Expects Every Man To Do His Duty* (1937), *Blood Is Cheaper Than Water* (1939), and *The News and How To Understand It* (1940).

HOWARD C. PETERSON—Now Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Peterson was formerly executive assistant to the Under-Secretary of War. He was appointed to his present position in December, 1945. Also in December, he was presented with the Exceptional Civilian Service Award for duties performed since 1941. He had already received a Medal of Merit.

Before Mr. Peterson joined the War Department he was a member of the law firm of Cravath, DeGersdorff, Swaine & Wood in New York City.

JOHN REAGAN (TEX) McCRARY—Mr. McCrary, formerly Lieutenant Colonel in the Army Air Forces, is now executive editor of the *American Mercury*. During the war, he served in the Mediterranean area, and was a Public Relations Officer for the 8th Army Air Force.

Mr. McCrary started his newspaper career as a copy boy on the *New York World-Telegram*. He later became chief editorial writer for the *New York Daily Mirror*.

Finally, we maintain sizeable occupation armies in Germany and Japan and have scattered more of our troops in many other parts of the world. We now have more men under arms than we shall have, even if Congress extends the draft, but even so, we have not got enough men to make our present policy stick.

Secretary Byrnes has thus fallen into the pit that swallows up all those leaders who know only the art of compromise. On August 6, 1945, when the first atomic bomb

dropped on Hiroshima, our policy makers missed what may be the chance of a century to assert America's world leadership.

At that moment, when our power had reached its peak, the United States might have offered to surrender some national sovereignty and to pool this power of ours with any like-minded members of the United Nations that were prepared to meet us half way. Or, we could have played it safe—admitted that world organization took time and concentra-

ted on improving Big Three relations.

This would have meant agreeing to respect Russia's primary interest in certain regions, agreeing to respect Britain's primary interest in other regions; and defining those regions in which the British and the Russians should respect our primary interests. But instead of making a clear-cut choice, Secretary Byrnes played it both ways and now has made the worst of both worlds.

I don't deny that failure of Congress to extend the draft may cause our present military and foreign policies to crack up. But I not only advocate taking that chance, I believe that the best hope for peace lies in a complete revision of the policies which our leaders are following today. (*Applause.*)

If anything has got to crack up, let it be those policies—not our country or the world. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Quincy Howe. Well I think that, Mr. Lampell, your dream has come true, and a dream of a great many Americans has come true—that it's possible for the Assistant Secretary of War, a distinguished radio commentator, a former lieutenant colonel, and a former GI to gather up here around the microphone to discuss the question of whether we should extend the draft or not, before a radio audience of millions of peo-

ple. That's a tribute to the whole Nation.

Mr. Peterson, will you sound off with a question for any one of these gentlemen?

Mr. Peterson: I'm very pleased to learn that Mr. Howe is "on the side of the angels" and thinks that the War Department should have more men than we modestly request.

Mr. Lampell would lead you to believe that we are on the road to war with the extension of the draft—preparing for war.

Now, the facts are these: We have today in the Army 2,300,000 men. In July of this year, we will have 1,550,000. In July of 1947, we will have 1,070,000 men, less than one-half the number we now have. Now, that seems to me quite the reverse of preparing for war. We need the draft to maintain a declining force. I'd like to ask Mr. Lampell how he can square his assertions with these facts.

Mr. Lampell: I would first like to say that extension of the draft cannot be taken out of context with the rest of our foreign policy. I did not at any point say that we are on the road to war. I said that some people in this country are on the road to war.

I place extension of the draft in context with the cry of the brass for control of atomic energy, with the attempt of many of our politicians to make an issue of Iran in

the Security Council instead of setting it off to a start on the issues where nations have cooperation and understanding.

It seems to me that when all these things add up, they add up to a chip on the shoulder of foreign policy which must invariably affect the Army. You speak about future plans. Well, I know that no future plans are so set that when our foreign policy changes, the Army's plans won't change with it. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Peterson.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Lampell, in his main speech, inferred that we were in 50 nations, friendly nations, and the inference of his speech was that we were there against those nations' consent. Nowhere on the face of the world are we occupying any territory without the consent of the nation. In most of these foreign bases we're closing out as rapidly as can be. In a number of the long list of names that Mr. Lampell named off, the troops there are very small indeed; example, Australia—490 troops today; zero July 1, 1946.

Mr. Lampell: I'd like to answer that, just for a moment. You say that we're there with the consent of the nation, by which you mean, of course, the government and not the people, in some cases. (*Applause.*) For example, we have 79,000—I got this out of the paper, so I'm sure it's not confidential—troops in the Philippines, and that

figure is earmarked for July 1, something which is very interesting when you realize that July 1 is a date set *after* the date of the vote for Philippine independence.

Mr. Peterson: July 4th is the date of Philippine Independence (*laughter*), but that's a small matter. But I think the Philippines is a very good example of the problems the Army faces in closing out this war. There is no Philippine constabulary today, which means that the Army has to maintain civil order there. As you know, in the Philippines there have always been some tribes that didn't quite take to government.

Another factor is there are about 5,000 guerillas—Japanese guerillas—still fighting in the Philippines. We have billions of dollars of property to care for in the Philippines. We provide logistical support for Japan from the Philippines. We are training 50,000 Philippine Scouts so that they may take their rightful role and defend themselves. Now, that's a huge training job. Those are the functions we're performing in the Philippines, and we're performing them with the Philippines' consent. They want us there. That's why we're there—to help them. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. McCrary?

Mr. McCrary: I hate to be put into a corner in the position of defending the State Department

because, I think, Mr. Denny, some time ago on this program we had a prescription for the State Department, which was that they turn all their top secret files over to the Associated Press so that we'd know what's going on down there. But, there's one question I'd like to ask: Could you define, in a few words, the sort of a foreign policy that you would recommend for this country, and state at which point you would be willing to have this country resort to universal conscription and fight to uphold that principle?

Mr. Denny: I think that's for Mr. Howe.

Mr. Howe: Well, the foreign policy I would recommend to this country now, as I indicated but didn't say specifically in my talk, the foreign policy I would recommend now would be to base our hopes for peace and security on closer relations among the Big Three. (*Applause.*) My own preference would have been for a world organization on a broader basis. I think the time for that has past. I think you've got to work from the Big Three and slowly build from that up and gradually develop a world organization.

As far as when the time would come that you would fight, I recommend that Mr. McCrary read this excellent book, *One World or None*, and he will find out there just isn't going to be any next time

to fight because if there is a next time to fight, it'll be the last time for everybody. (*Applause.*)

Mr. McCrary: Now what Mr. Howe seems to be talking about is a form of collective bargaining. I'll tell you one thing that labor learned—and maybe some of you will agree with me—that you can't have collective bargaining, you can't create an atmosphere or a possibility for collective bargaining until you have equality on both sides in the collective bargaining. What we're talking about with extension of the draft and maintenance of sufficient force to maintain national security is exactly that equality of strength with the other members of the Big Three.

I think it is interesting to note that no other member of the Big Three is talking about ending conscription. As a matter of fact, Russia is even talking about building a navy. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Lampell: But, Colonel, we have the atom bomb. We have shown that we would like to try to keep the atom bomb.

Mr. McCrary: I would like to know how we're going to occupy Japan and Germany with the atom bomb. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: I think this is a very good place for us to pause briefly for station identification.

Announcer: You are listening to America's Town Meeting of the Air from Town Hall in New York City where we are carrying on a

discussion of the question "Should We Continue the Draft Beyond May 15?" We have heard from Assistant Secretary of War Howard C. Peterson, Radio Commentator Quincy Howe, and veterans "Tex" McCrary and Millard Lampell. They are about to take questions from the audience. For a complete copy of this discussion

including the question period which is to follow immediately, send for the Town Meeting Bulletin. Just write to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, and enclose ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. Be sure to include your zone number and allow at least two weeks for delivery.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: To promote good questions, friends, remember that Town Hall is offering a \$25 United States Savings Bond for the question that's considered best in the opinion of our committee of judges for the purpose of bringing out facts and clarifying this discussion, provided the question is limited to twenty-five words. We selected a number of questions from several hundred sent in by our radio audience, also, and we are paying \$5 for each one of these questions used. So, let's start the questions with the gentleman over here on the aisle. Right there.

Man: My question is to Mr. Lampell. You said, "Let's try to understand other nations." Isn't it because Russia does not let us understand her that we must be prepared?

Mr. Lampell: No, I do not think so. I think that it is incumbent upon us to take a position of leadership and responsibility and understanding, to move quickly and

first. I think that in many cases, if we check back over our foreign policy during the last twenty years, you will find that what we gave Russia during her early years was a steady diet of suspicion, attack, deceit, hatred. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman on the aisle.

Man: Mr. McCrary, should we disarm, and trust Russia, who attacked Finland, then Poland, and became our ally only after she was attacked by Germany, to keep the world's peace? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. McCrary, I believe that's called a leading question.

Mr. McCrary: I think you have picked the wrong target, which is what some people accused the Air Forces of from time to time. I don't think I'm the right man to answer that question actually because I think Mr. Lampell is your target. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Lampell?

Mr. Lampell: I think you're forgetting something. Poland and Finland did not come until after Spain, Manchuria, and Munich. You will remember that it was not us, but Mr. Molotov who stood up in the League of Nations and said, "Look. Let's smack Hitler down in Spain. What do you say, boys?" And we sat quietly by. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: The gentleman wants to talk back. All right, yes. Go ahead.

Man: Following those actions, Mr. Lampell, Russia made a non-aggression pact with Hitler. She didn't make any alliance with the United States. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Lampell: I think the question is still open to discussion as to who it was during the Munich period who did not want an alliance with whom. It seemed that we were the ones who did not want collective security against fascism during the early '30's. It was not Russia. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Tex, do you want to get in on this?

Mr. McCrary: No.

Mr. Denny: All right, we'll take the gentleman who has a question for Mr. Peterson.

Man: Secretary of War Patterson stated that without Selective Service we shall be short of requirements by 170,000 men. Could these men be recruited on a voluntary basis by a 20 or 30 per cent increase in pay as suggested by

the War Department, or even 50 per cent increase in pay as suggested by some Congressmen?

Mr. Peterson: We have, as you stated, asked for a pay raise of 20 per cent and we do feel that that will prove a definite stimulation to recruiting. However, you cannot hope to equalize army pay unless you are to bankrupt this country. A farmhand can make \$100. The basic pay is \$50 in the Army. Even a 20 per cent increase, which is costly, doesn't equalize it. So the answer is that though we think we should do all these things to make army life more attractive, including pay raises, we still think we need the insurance of the draft so that if enough volunteers aren't forthcoming, we'll get the men we think we require.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The next question back in the hall.

Man: I'm addressing my question to Mr. Howe. You mentioned that our State Department learned only compromise. Yet, how are we to keep the peace without compromise and that such a compromise with an Army?

Mr. Howe: I think the answer to keeping peace without compromise—of course, you have to compromise to a certain point. But it seems to me that the policy of the State Department, and it was beautifully shown today up at the United Nations meeting, has been for Mr. Byrnes to take a position such as he took last week

on Iran saying that he was going to do everything for the small nations — doing everything thereby that could possibly make Russia walk out. Then the minute Russia had walked out, he does everything possible to get Russia back in again, forgetting about the small nations. I think that Mr. Byrnes has a constitutional love of compromise for the sake of compromise and that he feels that by continued compromise he's somehow satisfying everybody when, as a matter of fact, the result is that he irritates and needles everybody, both the Russians and the smaller nations. That, I think, is the essence of the policy we're following under Mr. Byrnes and that, I think, is a very dangerous one. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Peterson and Mr. Lampell, here's a question for both of you from Berkeley, California. "Would pay increases, elimination of the caste system, social insurance, and educational opportunities stimulate enlistments and so make the draft unnecessary?"

Mr. Peterson: I think all these things would be very helpful and we all realize that we must take major steps to make the Army more attractive. The Army has not been an attractive career in this country and we've got to make it one. We want to do this job with volunteers. As I've said before, we've advocated a 20 per

cent pay increase. We have a board headed by Lieutenant General Doolittle, who is now in civvies, and on which, Sergeant Lampell, there are two honest-to-Heaven sergeants, and they're now studying the so-called caste system. We're going to have a new and modern streamlined Army, but we still think we need the insurance of the draft so that if enough volunteers aren't forthcoming, we will get the men we need. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Lampell?

Mr. Lampell: I just have a note I would like to add. I have been reading in the papers that the Army has now decided, in a great burst of the Christmas spirit, to allow GI's to wear the same uniform as officers. (*Laughter.*) I would like to point out that this, to my mind, is not what I think of when I think of democracy in the Army. I am thinking of really basic issues in the Army such as the question of freedom of speech, and the lack of censorship of GI newspapers and the question of segregation of Negroes. These are really democratic questions in the Army. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young man in the uniform there.

Man: Mr. McCrary. Do you think that the United States has made a real effort to establish world disarmament?

Mr. McCrary: I don't think that we have yet. No. I think

we made a tremendous effort to establish disarmament before the last war. I don't think that it kept us from having another war. I think that after we achieve law and order and end of revolution and end of famine, and end of persecution in the world, we can begin to disarm ourselves, but turn over our armed forces to a world police force. I don't think we are ready for that step yet. I hope it comes soon. *(Applause.)*

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Howe, here's a question for you from Elmwood Place, Ohio. "In a world bristling with armed might and suspicion, and no workable peace plans, how can we have national security without continuing the draft?"

Mr. Howe: I believe the best way to approach national security is, as I said before, to start improving and consolidating relations among the Big Three and after that, in this world bristling with arms, I suggest that we, as the strongest and most invulnerable power, should stop bristling. *(Applause.)*

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman on the aisle.

Man: My question is directed to Mr. Peterson. If the draft law is continued, Mr. Peterson, won't it mean that a lot of personnel that are vital to industrial industry today will be drafted?

Mr. Peterson: I think not. There is a large measure of unem-

ployment today, unfortunately. I think there will be plenty of people to be drafted.

Man: *(Words indistinguishable.)*

Mr. Peterson: As you know, the deferments for occupational reasons have, since the war has been over, been made very liberal indeed. I do not think we are going to take technical personnel out of plants and thus deter reconversion in any way.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. McCrary, a question for you from Lynchburg, Virginia. "With Germany and Japan disarmed, and control of atomic bombs for aggressors, and defense do we need such numbers that we have to draft?"

Mr. McCrary: Well, Mr. Peterson has tried to point out, based on expert opinion, how many men we need to do the occupation job. He has also pointed out that you cannot occupy a country with an atomic bomb. As a matter of fact, the atomic bomb has made the task of occupying Japan a great deal more difficult.

I don't think it is generally realized the extent of the job of occupation and the quality of manpower you have to get and the extent of training that is necessary. In Germany there are thousands, approximately 50,000, peoples still to be tried, still to be arrested as Nazis. There are approximately 3,000 enemy installations in Ger-

many that have to be destroyed yet. There are approximately half a million prisoners of war still in camps in Germany. There are approximately 65,000 displaced persons in Germany in camps that must be run by us. The threat of famine in Japan and Germany is very real.

All these things require experienced men. You can't get experienced men. They're going out of the Army—the fathers and the older men. The younger men that are coming in to replace them need more training and you need more of them. These are the reasons, I think, the draft should be extended as an insurance that we will never have a shortage of the men required for these jobs. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Lampell has something to add.

Mr. Lampell: You know, I have been hearing about these reliable figures and also about General Eisenhower, whose opinion we respect, and I would like to emphasize one point which we cannot hit too often. General Eisenhower's figures must always be based upon what are State Department policies. I say that we have to go deeper than the draft and as long as we have extension of the draft, there will be an excellent reason for the State Department to continue right along its blundering way. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. McCrary.

Mr. McCrary: I think that history will demonstrate that one of the reasons we have had no foreign policy, except one of either reaction to the British, or reaction to the Germans, or reaction to somebody else, the reason we have never had a direct, positive, continuing, and coherent American foreign policy is because there has been a continuing tendency on the part of American people to say: Let some vague "they" in Washington take care of our security.

That is the real threat of believing that national security can be placed on, say, a squadron of bombers carrying atomic bombs. National security—the first step to it—is universal recognition of universal, mutual responsibility for foreign policy. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you.

Lady: Mr. Howe. Defensively, we have the world's largest fleet and Air Force. If we increase our Army also, will not other nations regard us as planning aggression?

Mr. Howe: I think perhaps that question should be addressed to somebody else, but I would say that we are not planning to increase the size of our Army. Our Army is now over 2,000,000 and even the most rabid proponents of the draft want to reduce it to 1,500,000. I don't think that many people will believe that we are aggressive-minded as a result of these preparations.

I think, though, that the Russians are going to be—continue

to be—suspicious of us insofar as we continue atomic secrecy and a good deal of the military preparations. That is one of the reasons, but not the only one. That is one of the reasons that I think the continuation of the draft is unwise.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Howe. Mr. Peterson says you've answered that question satisfactorily for him. Here's a question for Mr. Lampell from Tacoma, Washington. "Have you one reason that will satisfy my husband, the father of two children, who will remain overseas for some time unless the draft continues?" A reason that will satisfy her husband, who is the father of two children. All right, Mr. Lampell, give her one.

Mr. Lampell: Well, this'll have to be half an answer, because I'm only the father of one child. That is a stacked question. You say he will remain overseas unless the draft continues. I say that with a democratic Army, with a sound foreign policy operating for peace, and by removing some of our troops in friendly countries, your man will come home and we will not need extension of the draft.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Peterson?

Mr. Peterson: Nevertheless, Sergeant Lampell, it is true that if the draft is extended the Army expects to discharge this fall the 120,000 fathers now in service.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Young lady in the balcony.

Lady: Mr. Peterson I would like to know, will the streamlined Armed service mean the ending of the excuses for continuing the un-American, un-democratic tradition of segregation against Negroes in the armed services? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Peterson: I think you're badly misinformed, Miss. The Army has not had a segregation policy throughout the war and has not one now. (*Shouts.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. This is not exactly on the subject of the evening, but go ahead. Mr. Lampell.

Mr. Lampell: Well, it's on the subject because it deals with democracy in the Army. Now, you may sit in an office in Washington. I was in camps where Negroes were made (*applause*)—in Basic Training Center No. 10, to give you the exact figure so that you can conduct an investigation from Washington, which I know you'll want to do—Negroes were made to go to separate theatres, eat in separate mess halls, they were put on labor battalions to clean up butts, they were not allowed to train as aviation mechanics or as pilots, except in one small outfit—the 99th Fighter Squadron—which hung up, incidentally, a very good record—and as far as I could see—and I have lived both in the

1947
South and the North—there was plenty of segregation. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Peterson: About 10 per cent of the population of the United States is Negro. Of the recent recruiting, since recruiting started in an intensive way, over 17 per cent of all the recruits are Negroes. Now, that's some evidence to me that these discriminations of which you speak do not exist. (*Shouts.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. I don't think that was quite on the subject tonight, but we're going to have to stop right now while Mr. Howe and Mr. Peterson prepare their summaries for this evening's discussion. We'll hear from them again in just a moment. Now, here's our announcer to tell you about your Town Meeting for next week.

Announcer: I'm sure you've noticed, friends, how your Town Meeting keeps you right up to date with each great public question when it is most timely. Last week it was atomic energy, while the hearings were up before the Senate, and with three of the principals concerned with this legislation. This week it is the extension of the draft, while hearings on this question are taking place in the House.

Next week, we turn to the most crucial, immediate problem on the international scene: The Russian-Iranian crisis. Next week our topic will be, "What Are the Real Issues Behind the Russian-Iranian

Dispute?" Our authorities will be Edgar Ansel Mowrer, author and foreign correspondent; Louis Fischer, foreign correspondent and author of *Men in Politics*; William Shirer, foreign correspondent and radio commentator; and Max Lerner, author and chief editorial writer for *PM*. Now, for the summaries of tonight's discussion, we return you to Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: For the negative of this question, "Should We Continue the Draft Beyond May 15?" let's hear the summary from Mr. Howe.

Mr. Howe: Well, I was very proud to have Mr. Lampell up here with me. He certainly saved me a lot of explaining to do. His big point, and the big point that we made was the emphasis that he gave to the idea of democracy. That, I think, we stood up on pretty well against our opponents.

I think Mr. Peterson made a good point on the need for the draft in the way of the manpower. I think Mr. McCrary made a good point on his side insofar as we need to have a sense of obligation to the community.

But I really believe that the points Mr. Lampell and I made—Mr. Lampell hitting hard on this democracy proposition, unless you have that, I don't think that the obligations of all these things that Mr. McCrary and Mr. Peterson talk about—unless there is the underlying kind of democracy that

Mr. Lampell has called for, I don't think the obligations and all the rest of it are going to mean so much. For my part, I still feel that by taking a strong attitude now on this draft business and bringing the State Department up a little bit short, maybe it will mend its ways. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Howe. Now Mr. Peterson for the affirmative.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Howe would have you believe that both Tex McCrary and myself are fascists. I can assure you we're equally in favor of democracy as he. The case for the extension of Selective Service seems to me to rest on four main factors. We've got certain jobs. Now normally in peacetime the Army has the job of securing the defense of this country. But after all, the war has only been over 11 months, and there's a great aftermath of that war, and we've got to win the peace. Now part of that job is the occupation of Japan and Germany. Part of that job is liquidating our bases overseas, disposing of surplus property, and part of that job is seeing to the birth of the United Nations,

for which we all must strive with all our might to make it succeed because that's our hope for peace.

Now, we've got to live up to those commitments. To do that, it requires a certain number of men and there hasn't been a dispute as to the number needed. If we fail to get the volunteers, we're gambling with winning this peace that we fought so hard for.

All we want is insurance of the draft. If we get enough volunteers, no one, I assure you, will be drafted. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, very much, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Lampell, Mr. Howe, and Tex McCrary for a fine discussion of this important question. Now I've just received a vote of our committee of judges which has awarded a \$25 United States Savings Bond for tonight's best question for the following question: "Would pay increases, elimination of the caste system, social insurance, and educational opportunities stimulate enlistments and so make the draft unnecessary?" submitted by Miss Bernice Evans Harding of Berkeley, California. Congratulations, Miss Harding. (*Applause.*)

MAY 2 1947



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

16. Will the Returning Soldier Be a Problem?
17. Should We or an International Authority Control Strategic Bases in the Pacific?
18. How Can We Make Jobs for All Now?
19. Should Hollywood Make Movies Designed To Influence Public Opinion?
20. Should We Continue the Draft for at Least Two Years?
21. Who Should Control the Atomic Bomb?
22. How Can We Assure a Lasting Peace in Japan?
23. Is the Full Employment Bill a Threat to Private Industry?
24. Increase?
25. On What Basis Can Russia and the Western Powers Reach a Peace Settlement?
26. Should We Share the Secret of the Atomic Bomb With Any Other Nation?
27. How Can We Find a Basis for Industrial Peace?
28. Should We Support the Establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine Now?
29. Should We Have a Single Department for Our Armed Forces?
30. We Won the War; Are We Winning the Peace?
31. Does the Atomic Bomb Make World Government Essential Now?
32. Should Colonial Empires Be Liquidated?
33. What Should Be Our Policy in China?
34. What Must We Do To Denazify the German People?
35. Should Congress Approve the Proposed Loan to Britain?
36. Can We Find a Substitute for Strikes?
37. Which Way to Full Employment?
38. Do We Need More Democracy in Our Armed Forces?
39. Are We Losing Our Religion?
40. How Can We Get Better Teachers in Our Schools?
41. What Must We Do To Help Feed Europe?
42. Do Our Movies Tend To Raise or Lower Our Moral Standards?
43. Have Britain and America Any Reason To Fear Russia?
44. Who Should Control the Production and Use of Atomic Energy?

Order single copies at 10c each from TOWN HALL, INC.,
123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y.

Any Twenty-six Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will Be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate: { Any 26 Weeks Only
\$2.35
Single Copies 10c